



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/328,910	06/09/1999	YUJIRO KAJIHARA	500.32049R00	7455

20457 7590 03/20/2006

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP  
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET  
SUITE 1800  
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873

EXAMINER
----------

CLARK, JASMINE JHIHAN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2815

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/328,910

Applicant(s)

KAJIHARA ET AL.

Examiner

Jasmine J. Clark

Art Unit

2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 June 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 08/038,684.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/7/00, 1/22/01, 8/13/01
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

### ***Numbering of Claims***

1. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 37-49, because these claims 37-49 were previously cancelled and the amendment of 09/28/2004 reinstated these claims. This is improper. Please note that a claim was previously cancelled may be reinstated only by adding the claims as a "new" claim with a new claim number.

For example: there are claims 1-63 submitted by the applicants, and since claims 37-49 were cancelled and re-instated, these claims should be renumbered beginning from 64-76.

### ***Defective Reissue Oath-Declaration***

2. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1), a supplemental reissue oath/declaration under 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1) must be received before this reissue application can be allowed.

Claims 1-63 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue "oath and declaration" under 35 U.S.C. 251. See 37 CFR 1.175. The nature of the defect is set forth above.

Art Unit: 2815

Receipt of an appropriate supplemental oath/declaration under 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1) will overcome this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 251. An example of acceptable language to be used in the supplemental oath/declaration is as follows:

"Every error in the patent which was corrected in the present reissue application, and is not covered by a prior oath/declaration submitted in this application, arose without any deceptive intention on the part of the applicant."

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. Claims 45-47, and 50-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Concerning claims 45, an adhesive layer is not provided on each of said suspension leads which is located under said semiconductor chip. Please see the Spec in column 8, lines 51-65.

Concerning claim 47, there is no support for "thermosetting resin". Please see the Spec in column 10, lines 11-14.

Concerning claim 50, the Spec does not teach only two suspension leads (please see column 10, lines 65-67), and does not support the term "flagless," and "shift presenting positions". Please see column 8, lines 51-60.)

Art Unit: 2815

Concerning claim 51, the Spec does not teach only two suspension leads intersecting at right angles. Please see column 10, lines 65-67).

Concerning claims 52 and 54, the Spec does not support "tetragonal shape". Please see amendment filed of July 6, 1995 in parent application.

Concerning claim 55, the Spec does not teach only two suspension leads. Please see column 10, lines 51-60, and it does not support "shift-preventing positions". Please see column 8, lines 51-67.

Concerning claims 57 and 59, the Spec does not support "tetragonal shape". Please see amendment filed of July 6, 1995 in parent application.

4. Claims 50-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "flag-less" in claim 50, in part 4, line 4 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "flag-less" is not defined by the claim, the Spec does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

#### ***Improper Broadening***

5. Claims 15-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being broadened in a reissue application filed outside the two year statutory period. The instant reissue application, filed June 9, 1999, is a reissue of US Patent 5,637,913, which claims

Art Unit: 2815

priority under 35 USC 120 to US Patent 5,378,656. US Patent 5,378,656 issued on January 3, 1995 almost four and half years before the filing of this reissue.

Claims 15-36 in the instant reissue are each broader than claims 1-23 of US Patent 5,378,656 in respect that claims 15-36 do not require the step of bonding the semiconductor chip to the chip mounting portion. A claim is broader in scope than the original claims if it contains within its scope any conceivable product or process which would not have infringed the original patent. A claim is broadened if it is broader in any one respect even though it may be narrower in other respects.

While it is acknowledged that claiming subject matter that was not claimed in the original patent is not improper in and of itself, in re Amos 21 USPQ 2d 1271, claims 15-36 in this reissue are clearly an attempt to broaden claims of US Patent 5,378,656. This broadening is impermissible because it effectively undermines the purpose of the state, 35 USC 251 fourth paragraph, which is to put the public on notice of any intent to broaden within two years after issuance of the patent.

### ***Double Patenting***

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686

Art Unit: 2815

F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 37-49 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 15-27 of copending Application No. 09/987,978.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection, because the conflicting claims have not in facts been patented.

#### ***Recapture of Cancelled Subject matter***

7. Claims 37-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based. See *Pannu v. Storz Instruments Inc.*, 258 F.3d 1366, 59 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Hester Industries, Inc. v. Stein, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Clement*, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Ball Corp. v. United States*, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A broadening aspect is present in the reissue which was not present in the application for patent. The record of the application for the patent shows that the

Art Unit: 2815

broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to claim subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope of claim subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.

Applicants have broadened/omitted certain claim requirement surrendered during prosecution of the patent in reissue (US 5,637,913). A review of the prosecution of the patent in reissue (US 5,637,913). A review of the prosecution of application No. 08/311,021, which matured into US Patent No. 5,637,913, reveals that, in response to the PTO's rejection of all claims on February 6, 1995, Applicant amended his claims and argues that the claimed invention discloses unique and novel arrangement of parts, for example, arrangements wherein said chip mounting portion is smaller than a semiconductor chip attached thereto, and is positioned under a substantially central portion of the semiconductor chip , wherein the semiconductor chip is fixed to the chip mounting portion by adhesive, and wherein the semiconductor chip is fixed to a part of each of the suspension leads by adhesive which is located under a peripheral portion of the semiconductor chip. Further, in response to the PTO's rejection of all the claims on May 14, 1996, Applicant amended the claims and argues the suspension leads and chip mounting portion of the lead frame are continuously formed in an area of the semiconductor chip to advantageously and instrumentally maximize the area of resin contact to the semiconductor chip.



Art Unit: 2815

***Telephone Inquiry Contacts***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jasmine J. Clark whose telephone number is (571) 272-1726. The examiner can normally be reached on Flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's SPRE, Jose Dees on (571) 272-1569. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jjbc/01/18/06

**JASMINE CLARK  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

